

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Official Action mailed on October 31, 2006. Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1 and 20 have been amended by this submission.

Claims 1-9 and 20 are drawn to methods which stand rejected over the Collier patent. However, the Examiner noted in the remarks bridging pages 3 and 4 of the Detailed Action that the art of record does not specify a method having this order of steps. The Examiner indicated that the "order" needs to be more positively set forth in these claims. Accordingly, by the present amendments to claims 1 and 20, the rejection over Collier is believed to have been overcome by reciting an order among and relative to each of the steps. Collier, in contrast, is concerned with identifying physical cables and their locations in a fixed space relative to an original plan so that, for example, if the installer were to return 10 years later he or she would be able to identify a cable and its physical route. Collier does not teach or suggest a method having steps performed as recited in claims 1 and 20. Applicant submits that the present amendment does not narrow these claims because of the inherent order of the recited steps and further in view of the requirement that the steps be "ordered." Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-9 and 20 are requested.

Claims 10-19 are directed to a system for cabling management. While it appears that there is no disagreement that Collier does not teach or suggest the ordered steps recited in the method claims, the Patent Office's position with regard to the system claims is less clear.

The outstanding Office Action does not address any of the amendments made to these claims in Applicant's July 31, 2006 amendment. However, the features of the system claims in their present form have already been distinguished over the Collier patent. In particular, Collier does not teach or suggest "location identifier or identifiers physically applied to a location or locations." Rather, Collier describes "cable identifiers" without any corresponding feature to a location identifier. Accordingly, independent claim 10 is not anticipated by Collier, and independent claim 19 is not rendered obvious over Collier as Collier has no teaching or suggestion of a location identifier at all. Further, Collier describes a conceptually different system insofar as

has cables labeled after they have been positioned thereby having no use for a location identifier as recited in the system claims of this application. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10-19 is requested.

Dated: January 24, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

David Leason

Registration No.: 36,195
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(212) 527-7700
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant